

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of June 24, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and this paper is Applicants response thereto. Claims 49-71 are pending in the application. Claims 49-71 are rejected. By this response, claims 49, 54, 61, 65-71 have been amended. In particular, claims 54 and 67-71 were amended to fix inadvertent typographic errors in the dependent claims stated dependencies. No new matter has been added to the application.

Rejection under 35 USC §102 and §103

Claims 49-71 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeo, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,2190,837 (“Yeo”), or in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Yeo. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Yeo embeds a number of summary frames within a television broadcast of a program. The embedded frames are automatically displayed when the program is selected. (Figure 1, elements 20-24). The summary frames depict key scenes from the past which aid the viewer in quickly ascertaining the current plot or theme. The summary frames are selected from the video and embedded within the video prior to broadcasting. (Emphasis Added, Col. 3, lines 20-30).

Independent claims 49 and 61 have been amended to further clarify Applicants’ invention. Independent claims 49 and 61 include the claimed features of “receiving a request for the synopsis of the program during transmission of the program.” Applicants respectfully submit that Yeo does not disclose at least this claimed feature. Applicants’ current amendments further emphasize that a request from a user to view a synopsis of a program (such as television program) is requested while the user is receiving the transmission of the program. This is in stark contrast to Yeo where summary frames are not requests but instead are automatically displayed via summary frames 20, 22, and 24 without being requested. Therefore, for at least this reason Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 49 and 61 are allowable over Yeo.

Moreover, independent claims 49 and 61 are allowable for at least an additional reason. Both independent claims 49 and 61 include the claimed features of “upon receipt of the request for the synopsis, indentifying the portion of the program being transmitted via a clock time” and

“receiving a synopsis of the program from the beginning of the program transmission until the identified clock time.” (Emphasis Added). Yeo does not disclose these claimed features. In Yeo the summary frames are generated prior to being requested as they are already included with the broadcast of the program. Therefore, Yeo does not indentify any portion of a program being transmitted via a clock time so that a real time synopsis may be received by the user. Therefore, for at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 49 and 61 are allowable over Yeo. Dependent claims 50-60 and 62-64 which ultimately depend from one of independent claims 49 or 61 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

Independent claim 65 has been amended to further clarify Applicants’ invention. Independent claim 65 includes the claimed feature of “generating the synopsis only upon receipt of the request for the synopsis, the synopsis including at least a text summary of the program that was transmitted within a predefined time period prior to selecting the program.” (Emphasis Added). With this amendment Applicants are attempting to clarify that a synopsis of the program being viewed is only generated upon receipt of a request for the synopsis. Applicants respectfully submit that Yeo does not disclose at least this claimed feature. In Yeo, the summary frames are not generated upon receipt of a request. Furthermore, Yeo does not disclose a synopsis that includes at least a text summary of a program. Therefore, for at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 65 is allowable over Yeo.

Independent claim 66 has been amended to further clarify Applicants’ invention. Independent claim 66 includes the claimed feature of “wherein the source broadcasts the synopsis after receipt of a request to broadcast the synopses . . .” (Emphasis Added.). Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 66 is allowable for similar reasons a previously discussed with respect to independent claim 65. Dependent claims 67-71 which ultimately depend from independent claim 66 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

Claim 58 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeo as discussed with respect to claim 49, and further in view of Lawler, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,868,551 (“Lawler”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 55 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 49 from which it ultimately depends.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a finding of their allowability. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /John R. Buser
John R. Buser
Reg. No. 51,517
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 01/16/2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351